



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,037	10/27/2000	Steven G. Doughty	5053-31401/EBM	6766
7590 ERIC B. MEYERTONS CONLEY, ROSE & TAYON, P.C. P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			EXAMINER COLBERT, ELLA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3696	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/25/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/699,037

Applicant(s)

DOUGHTY, STEVEN G.

Examiner

Ella Colbert

Art Unit

3696

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 6-20 and 78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-16, 19, 20 and 78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 6-20 and 78 are pending. Claims 6, 8, and 78 have been amended in this communication filed 11/26/07 entered as Response After Non-Final Action.
2. The claim objection for claim 78 from the Prior Office Action has been overcome by Applicants' amendment to claim 78 and is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 6-10, 13, and 17-19 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 6, limitation five recites "storing a key definition ... from a transaction related data ...;". This claim limitation would be better recited as "storing a key definition ... from transaction related data ...;". Claim 7 has a similar problem with "the". Claim 8, line 4, page 3 recites "key definition comprises the user the user inputting ...". This line should recite "key definition comprises the user inputting ...". Claims 9 and 10 are in the improper method claim format. Claim 9 should begin with "selecting by the user one or more key elements ...; and selecting by the user one or more key elements ...". Claim 17 has a similar problem. Claim 10 should recite "defining by the user one of more key values ...; defining by the user a processing parameter ...;". Also claim 10 needs a comma (,) after "database" and before the "wherein" clause. Claim 13, 18, and 19 have a similar problem. Claim 6, line 6 recites "system, wherein storing the plurality of key definitions in the table comprises, for each of at least two rows in the database table:". It is unclear what the key definitions in the table comprises, for each of at least two rows in the database table:". Do Applicants mean "comprises one or more key definitions"? Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-16 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,794,229) French et al, hereafter French.

As per claims 6 and 31, French discloses, A computer-implemented method comprising: storing a plurality of key definitions in a database table of an Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system, wherein the FSO computer system is configured to perform processing on FSO transaction-related data, wherein the key definitions in the database table are configured for use in processing FSO transaction-related data in the FSO computer system, wherein storing the plurality of key definitions in the table comprises for each of at least two rows in the database table (col. 12, 37- col. 13, line 39): displaying two or more key element representations on a display screen in data communication with the Financial Organization (FSO) computer system; receiving a selection by a user of at least two key element representations from the two or more displayed key element representations (col. 5, lines 33-34 – a screen display device (106), col. 6, line 56-col. 7, line 6 and lines 17-35). The key elements are simply columns in a table of data. Receiving a selection by a user of at least two key element representations from the two or more displayed key element representations (col. 11,

line 46-col. 12, line 7); preparing a key definition from the two or more key elements corresponding to at least two selected key element representations in response to the user selecting the at least two key element representations (col. 7, lines 36-67 – preparing the key definition is simply preparing an SQL statement using the columns. The SQL statement SELECT SALES, DATE OF SALE is a SQL statement that picks two columns (col. 12, lines 10-36 and Fig. 3B shows the SQL query is requesting data from the two columns of the table (age and gender)); and storing the key definition in the database; the key definition being configured for use in preparing a processing key value from transaction-related data in the Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system (col. 12, line 37-col. 13, line 3 – storing the key definition is inherent since it is simply saving the SQL statement because the SQL statement has to be saved somewhere on the computer in order to for it to be seen), wherein the processing key value is configured for use in locating a process control data set in the database in the FSO computer system, the process control data set comprising one or more process control data values and configured for use in processing the transaction-related data in the FSO computer system (col. 7, lines 7-27 –the result when a SQL Query is run. The result will be displayed of all of the data in the SALES and DATE OF SALE columns).

As per claim 7, French discloses, The method of claim 6, wherein the user selecting the key element representations, the preparing the key definition, and the storing the key definition occur during a configuration of the FSO computer system (col. 7, lines 36-67, col. 12, line 10-col. 13, line 3, and Fig. 3B).

As per claim 8, French discloses, The method of claim 6, wherein preparing the key definition from the one or more key elements further comprises the user specifying a sequence of the key elements in the key definition comprises the user inputting one or more sequence parameters, at least one of one or more sequence parameters specifying the place of one of a selected key data element in a sequence of the selected key data elements for the key definition (col. 7, lines 2-24).

As per claim 9, French discloses, The method of claim 6, wherein the database comprises a plurality of data elements, and wherein the method further comprises: the user selecting a plurality of key elements for use in key definitions from the plurality of data elements; and the user selecting the one or more key elements for displaying on the display screen from the plurality of key elements (col. 6, line 56-col. 7, line 6 and lines 17-35 –see above claim 6).

As per claim 10, French discloses, The method of claim 6, further comprising: the user defining one or more key values for the key definition (col. 7, lines 22-35); the user defining a processing parameter value for each of the key values for the key definition (col. 11, line 63-col. 12, line 7); storing the one or more key values and processing parameter values in the database (col. 14, lines 15-34 and line 55-col. 15, line 18); wherein locating the processing parameter value using the constructed processing key value comprises matching the constructed processing key value with one of the one or more key values stored in the database (col. 5, lines 58-67, col. 6, lines 56-67, col. 7, lines 17-35, and col. 16, line 44 –col. 17, line 15).

As per claim 11, French discloses, The method of claim 10, wherein each of the one or more key values is unique among the one or more key values for the key definition (col. 7, lines 24-33).

As per claim 12, French discloses, The method of claim 10, wherein the database comprises a process control data table associated with the key definition, wherein the process control data table comprises one or more rows, and wherein each row in the process control data table comprises one or more fields for storing one key value and one or more fields for storing the processing parameter value for the key value stored in the row (col. 12, lines 51-66 and col. 13, lines 12-25).

As per claim 13, French discloses, The method of claim 10, wherein each of the one or more key values comprises one key element value for each of the one or more key elements in the key definition, and wherein the user defining the one or more key values for the key definition further comprises the user defining the one or more key element values for each of the one or more key values (col. 11, lines 53-col. 12, line 25).

As per claim 14, is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claims 9 and 10.

As per claim 15, French discloses, The method of claim 14, wherein the plurality of available key element values comprises a wildcard key element value (col. 12, lines 15-25).

As per claim 16, French discloses, The method of claim 6, wherein the database is relational or is object- oriented (col. 1, lines 23-27).

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,794,229) French et al, hereafter French and in view of (US 5,995,971) Douceur et al, hereafter Douceur.

As per claim 19, French failed to disclose, The method of claim 6, wherein the transaction-related data comprises a credit card transaction, and wherein the processing parameter value comprises one or more data values configured for processing the credit card transaction. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the transaction-related data comprise a credit card transaction, and wherein the processing parameter value comprises one or more data values configured for processing the credit card transaction and to modify in French since French does disclose product, price, and revenue in col. 12, lines 15-25 and because such a modification would allow French to have financial transaction data retained by a transaction processing system.

As per claim 20, French discloses, The method of claim 18, wherein the processing parameter value comprises one or more merchant transaction pricing values (col. 14, lines 15-34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 78 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,794,229) French et al, hereafter French.

As per claim 78, French teaches, A method performed in a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system, the FSO computer system comprising a database and the FSO computer system being configured to perform processing of FSO transaction related data, the method comprising: displaying on a display screen coupled to the (FSO) computer system a dictionary of data elements comprising one or more data elements associated with an FSO transaction-related data (col. 5, lines 33-34- screen display device (106), col. 6, line 56-col. 7, line 6 and lines 17-35); receiving a selection by a user of two or more data elements selected from the dictionary of data elements, for each of the selected data elements, receiving, for each of at least two of the selected data elements, an input from the user, the input comprising a sequence parameter specifying the place of the data element in a sequence of the two or more data elements, the selected data elements in the used-specified sequence defining a user-defined key, the user-defined key being configured during a configuration of the FSO computer system and describing a location of one or more corresponding data element values stored in an FSO database (col. 11, line 46-col. 12, line 7); and storing the user-defined key in the FSO database (col. 12, line 37-col. 13, line 3). French did not expressly disclose a dictionary of data elements. However, it would have been obvious to have a dictionary of data elements and to modify in French because such a modification would allow French to have the capability to access the data elements easier and faster since they would either be listed in ascending or descending order.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 17 with a method comprising: the user defining one or more key masks for the key definition, wherein each key mask comprises one or more mask fields, wherein the one or more mask fields in the key mask correspond to the one or more key elements in the key definition; and storing the one or more key masks in the database and claim 18 with a method wherein the user defining the one or more key masks further comprises the user selecting a mask field value from a plurality of mask field values for each of the one or more mask fields in each of the one or more key masks, and wherein the plurality of mask field values comprises an equal mask field value and a wildcard mask field value was not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Issue no. 1: Applicant argues: Inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities, the mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient. In re Robertson, 169F.3d 743, 745 (Fed.Cir. 1999) and Applicant submits that nothing in French is inherent or teaches or suggests, the features

of claim 6 of storing a plurality of key definitions in a database table, each key definition ...". Moreover, applicant submits that French does not teach or suggest storing a plurality of key definitions in a database table in a database of an Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system, ..." has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: Even though inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities one of ordinary skill in the art must consider that the (method or product) would achieve results that would have been predictable.

Issue no. 2: Applicant argues: Applicant submits that French does not teach or suggest a processing key value configured for use in locating a process control data set in a database in the FSO computer system, the process control data set including one or more process control data values and configured for use in processing the transaction-related data and French does not teach or suggest a process control data set configured for use in processing transaction-related data in a financial service organization computer system has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: According to Applicant's claim limitations it is interpreted that French discloses this above in col. 7, lines 7-27.

Issue no. 3: Applicant argues: Applicant submits that the cited portions of French do not appear to teach or suggest the user selecting the key element representations, preparing the key definition, and storing the key definition occur during a configuration of a financial service organization computer system has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: It is interpreted that French discloses this claim limitation in col. 7, lines 36-67, col. 12, line 10-col. 13, line 3, and Fig. 3B.

Issue no. 4: Applicant argues: Applicant submits that the cited portions of French do not teach of suggest a method in which preparing the key definitions ... has been considered but are not persuasive. Response: Applicant is arguing the amendment to claim 8 and this argument is considered moot.

Issue no. 5: Applicant argues: French teaches away from the features of claim 19 wherein the processing parameter value includes data values configured for processing transactions has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: The claimed limitation is considered a statement of desired or intended use. It would have been obvious one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the transaction-related data comprise a credit card transaction, and wherein the processing parameter value comprises one or more data values configured for processing the credit card transaction and to modify in French since French does disclose product, price, and revenue in col. 12, lines 15-25 and because such a modification would allow French to have financial transaction data retained by a transaction processing system.

Issue no. 6: Applicant argues: Applicant submits that French does not teach or suggest receiving from a user for each of two or more selected data elements displayed, an input including a sequence specifying the place of the data element in a sequence of the two or more data elements, the selected data elements in the user-specified sequence defining a user-defined key, the user-defined key being configured during a configuration of a financial service organization (FSO) computer system has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: Claim 78 recites "A method

performed in a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system, the FSO computer system comprising a database and the FSO computer system being configured to perform processing of FSO transaction related data, the method comprising: displaying on a display screen coupled to the (FSO) computer system a dictionary of data elements comprising one or more data elements associated with an FSO transaction-related data; receiving a selection by a user of two or more data elements selected from the dictionary of data elements, for each of the selected data elements, receiving, for each of at least two of the selected data elements, an input from the user, the input comprising a sequence parameter specifying the place of the data element in a sequence of the two or more data elements, the selected data elements in the used-specified sequence defining a user-defined key, the user-defined key being configured during a configuration of the FSO computer system and describing a location of one or more corresponding data element values stored in an FSO database; and storing the user-defined key in the FSO database which is not contained in Applicant's arguments. Therefore, these arguments are considered moot.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3696

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 571-272-6741. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, 5:30AM-3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dixon Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ella Colbert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

February 19, 2008

Application Number**Application/Control No.**

09/699,037

Examiner

Ella Colbert

**Applicant(s)/Patent under
Reexamination**

DOUGHTY, STEVEN G.

Art Unit

3696